



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,312	02/25/2002	David Kammer	PALM-3741.US.P	5496

7590 05/20/2005

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Third Floor  
Two North Market Street  
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

TRAN, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2682	

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,312

Applicant(s)

KAMMER ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan A. Tran

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

Claims 4 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase "said first hand held" should be changed to "said second hand held".

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-4, 13-16 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cannon et al. (2002/0090912).

Regarding claim 19, Cannon disclose an apparatus and method of establishing a Bluetooth wireless connection between hand held computers, the method comprising:  
a) storing a plurality of Bluetooth device Ids corresponding to a plurality of hand held computers system on a memory resident list of a specific hand held computer system (figs. 1-2 and page 2 [0032-0035]); b) accessing the plurality of Bluetooth device Ids on the specific hand held computer system (See figs. 1, 3 and page 2 [0036]); and c)

establishing a Bluetooth connection between the specific hand held computer system and the plurality of hand held computer systems, wherein the establishing bypassing a Bluetooth discovery process (See figs. 1-3 and page 2 [0036], page 3 [0037], [0045], page 4 [0057-0059]).

Claim 1 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 19.

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 19, as apparatus.

Regarding claim 20, Cannon discloses as cited in claim 19. Cannon further discloses at least one of the plurality of Bluetooth device Ids is automatically determined in communications between the specific hand held computer system and members of the plurality of hand held computer systems prior to step c (See fig. 2 and page 3 [0039-0044]).

Claim 2 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 20.

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 20, as apparatus.

Regarding claim 21, Cannon discloses as cited in claim 19. Cannon further discloses at least one of the plurality of Bluetooth device Ids is entered by a user of the specific hand held computer system (See figs. 1, 3 and page 3 [0047]).

Claim 3 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 21.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 21, as apparatus.

Regarding claim 22, Cannon discloses as cited in claim 20, Cannon further discloses step b comprising: accessing the plurality of Bluetooth device Ids; displaying representations of the plurality of Bluetooth device Ids on a display of the specific handheld computer system; and including at least one hand held computer system

corresponding to one of the plurality of Bluetooth device Ids in the Bluetooth connection (See figs. 1-3 and page 2 [0036], page 3 [0037], [0045], [0047]).

Claim 4 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 22.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 22, as apparatus.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 5-6, 17-18 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al. (2002/0090912).

Regarding claim 23, Cannon discloses as cited in claim 22. However, Cannon does not mention that one of the representations of the plurality of Bluetooth device Ids is a Bluetooth friendly name. Since Cannon suggests that one of the representations of the Bluetooth device Ids can be "MUSIC" for all entertainment Bluetooth devices or "APPL" for all Bluetooth appliance devices; therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure one of the representations of the plurality of Bluetooth device Ids is a Bluetooth friendly name for all friendly Bluetooth devices for the advantage of easily entering by a user and/or remembering by the user for manual input.

Claim 5 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 23.

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 23, as apparatus.

Regarding claim 24, Cannon discloses as cited in claim 20. However Cannon does not mention that responsive to a failure of step c, beginning the Bluetooth discovery. Since Cannon suggests that communication would not be permitted between devices not recognizing each others (See page 3 [0037], page 4 [0058]); therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the Bluetooth device to begin the Bluetooth discovery after unsuccessfully establishing connection with other Bluetooth devices for the advantage of allowing devices recognizing each other in order to establish connections between them for data exchange.

Claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 24.

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 24, as apparatus.

3. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al. (2002/0090912) in view of Pinder et al. (6,701,160).

Regarding claims 7 and 10-11, Cannon discloses a method for establishing a Bluetooth wireless connection between hand held computers comprising receiving a Bluetooth communication request at a hand held computer, wherein the Bluetooth communication request is an inquiry message and inherently comprises a source device Id (See fig. 2 and page 3 [0039-0044]). However, Cannon does not mention: automatically accessing on the hand held computer a memory resident list of trusted device Ids; and rejecting a Bluetooth communication request if the device Id is not a

Art Unit: 2682

member of the list of trusted device Ids and the communication request is also a page message. Pinder teaches a method of rejecting a mobile communication request comprising: receiving a mobile communication request at a mobile device, wherein the communication request is a page message and comprises a source mobile device Id; automatically accessing on the mobile device a memory resident list of trusted device Ids (acceptance list); and rejecting a mobile communication request if the device Id is not a member of the list of trusted device Ids (See fig. 4 and col. 4 line 39 to col. 5 line 21). Since both Cannon and Pinder teach method of establishing wireless connection, one in short range (Bluetooth) and the other in long range (cellular), between mobile devices; therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cannon's method with Pinder's teachings in both inquiring state or paging state for the advantage of allowing users to block selected incoming calls.

Regarding claims 8-9, Cannon & Pinder disclose as cited in claim 7. However, they do not mention displaying a representation of the device Id on the display of the hand held computer wherein the representation is a Bluetooth friendly name. Since Pinder further discloses alerting the user if the source Id is on the list of trusted device Ids (See col. 5 lines 34-45) and displaying source Id or name associated with a source Id of the incoming call is a well known technique in the art; therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the step of displaying Bluetooth trusted (or friendly or accepted) device name to the method

Art Unit: 2682

as disclosed by Cannon & Pinder for the advantage of visually alerting users "who" is calling such that they can determine whether or not accepting the call.

Regarding claim 12, Cannon & Pinder disclose as cited in claim 7, Cannon further discloses an entry in the list of trusted device IDs is automatically determined in a communication between the hand held computer and another Bluetooth enable device (See fig. 2 and page 3 [0039-0044]).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/07/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. The Applicant argued that Cannon teaches away from the claimed embodiments by disclosing a conventional Bluetooth discovery process (See Remark, pages 2-3). The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicants arguments because Cannon teaches a Bluetooth device is capable of establishing communications with other Bluetooth devices within an established piconet (Bluetooth discovery procedure has been taken place in order to establish the piconet) from a list (pairing list) obtained by conducting a procedure for pairing not by the Bluetooth discovery process (See fig. 1 and pages 2-3 [0033-0037]). For that reason, the Examiner remains the same rejections for all pending claims.

b. The Applicant argued that the proposed modification of Cannon in view of Pinder must change the principle of operation of Cannon and the combined teachings of Cannon and Pinder does not teach or suggest the claimed embodiments (See Remark,

pages 5-6). The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments because Cannon does teach a Bluetooth device is capable of establishing communications with other Bluetooth devices within an established piconet as well as establishing communications with a specified group of Bluetooth devices in response to communication requests that carried PIN(s) or pass codes as well as inherently source device ID matching with the stored PIN(s) or pass codes of the pairing list. However, Cannon does not mention that the Bluetooth device rejecting a Bluetooth communication request if the device ID is not a member of the list of trusted device IDs. Pinder teaches a method of rejecting a mobile communication request comprising: receiving a mobile communication request at a mobile device, wherein the communication request is a page message and comprises a source mobile device ID; automatically accessing on the mobile device a memory resident list of trusted device IDs (acceptance list); and rejecting a mobile communication request if the device ID is not a member of the list of trusted device IDs (See above rejections for more details). Since both Cannon and Pinder teach method of establishing wireless connection, one in short range (Bluetooth) and the other in long range (cellular), between mobile devices; therefore Cannon, in combination with Pinder, would arrive to the claimed embodiments. For that reasons, the Examiner remains the same rejections.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tuan Tran** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7858**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Vivian Chin**, can be reached at **(571) 272-7848**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2682

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



Tuan Tran

AU 2682



VIVIAN CHIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

5/16/05